

AD623943

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION		
Hard copy	Microfilm	
\$ 1.00	\$ 0.50	24
ARCHIVE COPY		

A Summary of the Final Report

COMMUNITY POWER ACTORS AND CIVIL DEFENSE



A delineation
of community power actors and an analysis
of their civil defense attitudes, knowledge,
behavior, and sources of information

Joe M. Bohlen
George M. Beal
Gerald E. Klonglan
John L. Tait

DDC
NOV 30 1965
TISIA B

Final Report Contract No. OCD-PS-65-9 . . . Research Subtask 4811-D

Submitted to: Office of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Sociological Studies in Civil Defense . . Project Co-Directors: George M. Beal and Joe M. Bohlen

Associate Director: Gerald E. Klonglan . . . Task Area Coordinator: John L. Tait

IOWA AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS EXPERIMENT STATION IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY of Science and Technology

Ames, Iowa . . 1965

A SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT

COMMUNITY POWER ACTORS

AND

CIVIL DEFENSE

A delineation of community power actors and an analysis of their civil defense attitudes, knowledge, behavior, and sources of information.

Joe M. Bohlen

George M. Beal

Gerald E. Klonglan

John L. Tait

Statistical Consultant

Richard D. Warren

Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station

Project No. 1529

Sociological Studies in Civil Defense

Project Directors: George M. Beal and Joe M. Bohlen

Associate Director: Gerald E. Klonglan

Task Area Coordinator: John L. Tait

in cooperation with

Office of Civil Defense

Office of the Secretary of the Army

Contract No. OCD-PS-65-9

Research Subtask 4811-D

OCD REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.

DDC AVAILABILITY

Distribution of this report is unlimited.

Rural Sociology Report No. 40S

Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station

Iowa State University of Science and Technology

Ames, Iowa

1965

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to acknowledge the research contributions of Dr. Ronald C. Powers and Mr. Quentin Jenkins. Their roles in helping to develop and test the social power model are greatly appreciated. They also made a major contribution in collecting the data.

The authors also wish to thank Mr. John Nye and Miss Billie Jo Marshall for their research contributions. In addition to assisting in the collection of data, John was responsible for much of the statistical analysis presented in this report. Miss Marshall played a role in checking the statistical computations and assembling data for both Appendixes A and B.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Objectives of the Report	2
Framework for Analysis	2
Methodology.	4
Analysis of Data	6
Personal and social characteristics	6
Civil defense and other community issue areas	8
Power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions	11
Attitudes toward civil defense	11
An individual's perception of the situation:	
perception of threat	11
Implications for civil defense	11
Fallout shelters: perception of a civil defense innovation	12
Implications for civil defense	13
Adequacy of civil defense programs.	14
Implications for civil defense	14
A general civil defense attitude.	14
Implications for civil defense	14
Knowledge of civil defense	15
Implications for civil defense.	15
Sources of civil defense information	16
Implications for civil defense.	16
Actions in civil defense	17
Implications for civil defense.	17

SUMMARY

Introduction

Every community in the United States is constantly undergoing social change. The rapid advances in scientific and technological knowledge have provided communities with more efficient and effective means for initiating social change. In determining the direction which social change will take the community is faced with decision-making which involves the adoption or rejection of new programs. The community in modern society copes with problems such as school reorganization, civil defense programs, slum clearance, recreational development, and area development as well as many other problems.

Among social scientists there is consensus that the social power to determine the direction of social change in the community is not randomly distributed among members of the community. While a majority of the members of a community may become actively involved in bringing about social change, a limited number of persons may participate in the crucial decision-making processes which determine the course of community action. These community members who have this social power are referred to as power actors.

Power actors may play an important role in the initiation and adoption of community civil defense programs. The local civil defense director has the responsibility of linking the civil defense organization and its objectives to the people of the community. If the local civil defense director and the civil defense organization are to achieve their objectives, it is vital to have a knowledge and understanding of power actors and the role that they may play in civil defense programs.

It seems essential that the local civil defense director have insights about social power and the power actors who have the capability to control or guide the behavior of community members. Through power actors the local civil defense director may be able to communicate knowledge and reinforce or change attitudes of community members about civil defense. If the local civil defense director is to effectively communicate with power actors about civil defense, he needs to know their current attitudes and knowledge about civil defense. These data should aid the local civil defense director in planning programs to communicate information about civil defense to power actors.

Objectives of the Report

The report is concerned with the relationship of community social power and civil defense. The specific objectives are (1) to define a social system model which is relevant to understanding the community in which the local civil defense director initiates and implements civil defense programs; (2) to define a social power model which can be used by the local civil defense director to analyze social power in the community and its possible relationship to community civil defense programs; (3) to compare the personal and social characteristics of power actors (a) among five communities and (b) with a random sample of all community actors in one community; (4) to study the relationship of power structures in other specified non-civil defense issue areas to the power structures in civil defense (a) among five communities and (b) within each of the five communities; and (5) to compare the civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions of power actors (a) among five communities and (b) with the civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions of other community actors. In addition, another objective is to discuss some of the implications of the findings for civil defense change agents.

Framework for Analysis

The local civil defense director needs an analytical model or framework to analyze and understand the relation of the local civil defense organization to its social environment. Two models are presented in the report which may serve as tools for the civil defense change agent (especially the local civil defense director) to analyze the social environment. The models may serve as tools which are vital to the initiation and implementation of new community programs by change agents.

The social system model provides a framework which the change agent may use to analyze the community and its component elements. A social system is composed of the patterned interaction of members. The elements of the social system include (1) belief (knowledge); (2) sentiment; (3) end, goal, or objective; (4) norm; (5) status-role (position); (6) rank; (7) sanction; (8) facility; and (9) power. The structure and value orientation of a social system at a given time can be described and analyzed in terms of these elements.

The social system model views the elements of the community in a static form. In reality, the elements of the social system do not remain static for

any length of time. Within each community there are processes which integrate, stabilize, and alter the relationships among the elements through time. These master processes which integrate or involve several or all of the elements are communication, boundary maintenance, systemic linkage, socialization, social control, and institutionalization.

In addition to the elements and processes, there are certain attributes of social systems which are never completely controlled by the system's members. These are referred to as general conditions for social action. They include territoriality, size, and time.

The social system or community in which the local civil defense director must implement the civil defense program consists of individual actors, families, businesses, industries, churches, service organizations, schools, athletic clubs, and many other sub-systems. These sub-systems are integrated into the local social system--the community. If the local civil defense director or other civil defense change agent were to analyze the complex community in its entirety, the social system model would provide one framework for this task. The research report has focused primarily upon one element of the social system, namely social power, and its meaning for the operations of civil defense in local communities.

A second model was delineated and defined for the purpose of providing an analytical framework which a local civil defense director or other civil defense change agent could use in analyzing social power in a community. Social power was defined as the capability to control the behavior of others. The major components of social power which were delineated included authority and influence. Authority was defined as the capability to control the behavior of others as determined by the members of the social system. Influence is that capability to control the behavior of others which is not formally designated in the authority component of the status-role. Influence is the unique possession of the individual who exercises it. The capability of an actor (or actors) to influence others resides in the individual actor and his facilities. Some examples of facilities are human relations skills, intelligence, wealth, control of mass media, past achievements, etc.

In addition to the two major components of social power, a third major concept, power structure, was delineated for studying social power in the community. A power structure is that pattern of relationships among individuals which enables the individuals possessing social power to act in concert to affect the decision-making of the social system on a given issue area.

In addition to the major concepts of the social power model, other concepts were defined which are relevant for the civil defense change agent to understand the phenomenon of social power in his community. These concepts included community actors, power actors, personal and social characteristics, existence of social power, legitimation, exercise of social power, latent social power, issue area, monomorphic power structure, polymorphic power structure, sources of power, and role performances.

The social power model which has been delineated provides a framework for the local civil defense director or other change agents to analyze social power in the social environment. If the local civil defense director or change agent is to put the model to an empirical test, a linkage must be made between the theoretical level and the empirical level.

Methodology

In 1960 approximately 40 percent of the total population in the United States lived in places which have a population of 5,000 people or less. These places include both towns and villages under 5,000 and the rural areas. This represents approximately 72 million people. Civil defense capabilities in small, rurally oriented communities are important due to the fact that these communities play a key role in supplying the nation's food and fiber. The five communities which were selected for the empirical study of social power are among the communities which supply the nation's food and fiber. According to the 1960 census the five places ranged in population from approximately 600 to 4500. They are Prairie City, Center Town, Cornerville, Annville, and Oak Town.

The methodology which was used to delineate the power actors in these five rural communities consisted of two phases. They included (1) interviews with external community knowledgeable and (2) interviews with internal community knowledgeable.

During the first phase of the field procedure external community knowledgeable were interviewed. External community knowledgeable were persons living outside the community who are perceived to have general knowledge of the community. They were interviewed for the purpose of (1) providing names of persons within the community who would have an extensive knowledge of the community decision-making process; (2) providing background information on past and present community issues; and (3) naming persons they perceived to be power actors.

The second phase involved interviews with internal community knowledgeable who were named by the external community knowledgeable as persons having an extensive knowledge of the community decision-making process. The internal community knowledgeable included men from different occupations within the community: education, agriculture, communications, labor, politics, business, and government.

The internal community knowledgeable were asked to name the persons whom they perceived to have social power in different issue areas. In South County where four of the five communities are located the issue areas were general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, and county courthouse. The issue areas in Prairie City which is located in Midwest County were general affairs, industry, education, business promotion, recreation, government, and obtaining farmer support.

Community actors who received the most mentions as having social power in the specified issue areas were arbitrarily established as the pool of power actors in each community. One hundred power actors were delineated through this process.

During the final phase of the field procedures in the five communities, 92 power actors were interviewed. The power actors were asked to complete rating scales designed to measure the amount of social power each power actor perceived each of the other power actors and himself to have in specified issue areas. The issue areas in South County were general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, county courthouse, and community fallout shelters. In Prairie City, the Midwest County community, the issue areas were general affairs, industry, politics, Midwest County Planning Commission, and the Midwest County Civil Defense Exhibit. In addition to obtaining data on power structures in different issue areas, each power actor provided his personal and social characteristics: his sex, age, formal education, occupation, income, political position, military service, residence in the state, residence in the community, home ownership, number of people living in the household, and number of children under 18 years of age living in the household. Power actors also provided data on their civil defense attitude, knowledge, sources of information, and actions.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of data in the report can be divided into three major parts. In the first part, the personal and social characteristics of power actors in five communities were compared. The personal and social characteristics of the power actors were also compared with the personal and social characteristics of a random sample in one community in Appendix A. The second part analyzed the relationship of the perceived civil defense power structure to power structures in other non-civil defense issue areas. In the third part, the power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions in five communities were compared. The power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions were also compared with the civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions of other community actors in Appendix B. These findings are summarized in the three following sub-sections.

Personal and social characteristics

The personal and social characteristics of community members are important variables for understanding the social structure of the community. The community actors who have social power to affect the community decision-making process may differ in personal and social attributes from other community members. In one community, Prairie City, the power actors differed significantly from a random sample of community actors in occupation, gross family income, education, political views, age, and home ownership. It was concluded that the power actors differ from the general populace in personal and social attributes.

The objective was to compare the personal and social characteristics of power actors in five Iowa communities. The power actors in the five communities were found to have similar personal and social attributes. No statistically significant differences were found among the power actors in five communities when the following variables were analyzed: sex, age, formal education, political orientation, military service, residence in state, residence in the community, home ownership, people living in the household, and number of children under 18 years of age.

The power actors were predominantly men with only two women among the 91 power actors interviewed. Nearly 60 percent were between 40 and 59 years of age. Over 90 percent of them had 12 years or more of formal education;

approximately 30 percent had college degrees. Fifty-five percent of the power actors were Republican in their political orientation, while nearly 20 percent were Democratic in their political orientation. About 50 percent of the power actors had served in the military service. Power actors tended to be long-time residents of both their state and community. Over 95 percent of the power actors owned their own homes. Fifty-five percent of the power actors had three or more people living in their households. Approximately 45 percent of the power actors had no children under 18 years of age.

Power actors in the five communities were largely engaged in business occupations. Approximately 63 percent were engaged in business, 10 percent in government, 9 percent in agriculture, 7 percent in professional occupations, 6 percent in communications, 2 percent in education, and 3 percent in other occupations (barber, school bus driver, and housewife).

Some differences occurred among the occupations of the power actors in the five communities. Professionals provided power actors in three communities, while no professionals were among the power actors in two communities.

Power actors differed in mean gross family income. In Prairie City and Center Town the mean gross family income was \$14,320 and \$16,000. The mean gross family income in Cornerville, Annville, and Oak Town was respectively; \$8,301; \$7,179; and \$8,472.

The differences in occupations and gross family income of power actors among the five communities may be due to differences in the communities. Prairie City and Center Town are larger, more complex social systems in comparison with the other three communities. They have larger retail businesses and more wholesale distributors than Cornerville, Annville, and Oak Town. Specialized services such as county government and medical services are also provided in Prairie City and Center Town.

Although some differences occurred among the gross family income and occupations of the power actors in the five communities, the power actors did not differ significantly on nine personal and social attributes. It is concluded that the personal and social attributes of power actors in the five communities are similar.

A comparison of power actors with a random sample of community actors in one community (Prairie City) pointed out that the personal and social attributes of a random sample differed significantly from the personal and social attributes of power actors. If these data are communicated to local civil defense

directors, it could help them delineate categories of people within the community in which power actors are most likely to be located.

There are likely to be businessmen, governmental employees, and professionals among the key power figures in the community. While key power figures may predominantly have the occupations of businessman, governmental expert, and professional, the local civil defense director should not ignore the possibility of key power figures being in other occupational groups. Power actors are likely to be found in the middle and upper income brackets and have a formal education beyond the high school level.

After delineating community power figures it may be valuable for the local civil defense director to obtain further data about power actors. A knowledge of the power actors' personal and social attributes such as sex, age, political position, military service, length of residence in the community and the state, home ownership, number of people living in the household, and number of children living in the household may be useful information in determining likely roles which power actors may play in future civil defense programs.

Civil defense and other community issue areas

The objective was to determine and analyze the relationship of the power structures in various issue areas to the community power structure in civil defense. In the four communities of South County, the perceived civil defense power structure was compared to the power structures in four other community issue areas (general affairs, business and industry, county courthouse, and county hospital). The power actors in Prairie City who participated in the Midwest County Civil Defense Exhibit were compared with their ranking in other community issue areas (general affairs, industry, and politics).

In South County the power actors in the four communities were considered as one sample for a statistical comparison of their mean power values in civil defense with their mean power values in general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, and county courthouse issue areas. There was a statistically significant relationship between the power actors' mean power values in civil defense and their mean power values in each of the four issue areas. Power actors in the four South County communities who have social power in the general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, and county courthouse issue areas were perceived to have social power if the community were to build a community fallout shelter in the near future.

A comparison of the top five power actors in civil defense with their rankings in general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, and county courthouse in each of the four communities points out that the top five power actors in civil defense tended to be among the top five in the other four issue areas. Although the tendency existed, some of the top power actors in civil defense were not among the top power actors in other issue areas.

Conceptually, in comparing civil defense with the other four issue areas in the four communities of South County, the power structure was monomorphic to the extent that the power actors who have social power in the general affairs, business and industry, county hospital, and county courthouse issue areas were perceived to have social power in civil defense if the community were to build a community fallout shelter in the future. The power structure in each of the South County communities was polymorphic to the extent that the top five power actors varied when comparing civil defense with the other issue areas. Although the power actors in civil defense may have social power in other issue areas, the structural relationship among the power actors tended to vary from issue area to issue area. While some power actors appeared among the top five power actors in each issue area, other top power actors tended to vary from issue area to issue area.

A comparison of the power actors who participated in initiating and implementing the Midwest County Civil Defense Exhibit in Prairie City with their rankings in other issue areas (general affairs, industry, and politics) indicated that they were generally not among the top power actors in these issue areas. The power structure in Prairie City for the comparison of the power actors who participated in a civil defense action program with their rankings in other issue areas was polymorphic.

In each of the four communities of South County some of the top five power actors in each community participated in legitimizing or implementing either or both the county hospital and the county courthouse issue areas. The power actors in Prairie City who did participate in the Midwest Civil Defense Exhibit played roles in initiating and implementing this action program.

There was some evidence in one South County community (Annville) that the top power actors in civil defense participated in a lower level issue such as a community promotion day program. In the county seat community (Center Town) in South County which is larger than Annville there was evidence that the perceived top power actors in civil defense had not participated in lower level issue areas such as Old Settler's Day and a community stamp plan. In Prairie

City which is a larger, more complex social system than any of the four communities in South County, the majority of the power actors were not knowledgeable about the Midwest County Civil Defense Exhibit as an action program. They were generally not involved in the legitimation and action phases of the Civil Defense Exhibit.

In addition to having social power in the other four issue areas in South County, the top five power actors in civil defense had systemic linkages with the top power actors in other issue areas. For example, one of the top five power actors in civil defense in one community was serving as his community's representative on the South County Civil Defense Committee. He was among the top power actors in general affairs and business and industry. In addition, he had informal linkages with the top power actors in these two community issue areas. In another example, one of the top five power actors in civil defense was the South County Civil Defense Director. He had linkages with other key power actors in his community.

The prime initiator and implementor of the Midwest County Civil Defense Exhibit had systemic linkages with the relevant power figures in general affairs, business and industry, and politics. Thus, in all five communities the top power actors in civil defense had linkages with other relevant power actors in other issue areas.

There are implications from these data for civil defense change agents. Although the top power actors in civil defense were perceived to have social power in other community issue areas, the power structures or patterns of relationships among power actors tended to vary from issue area to issue area. The local civil defense director is likely to find that the power structure in civil defense will differ from the power structures in other issue areas. In small communities he may find some power actors who play roles in legitimizing and implementing social action in a number of major issue areas which may include civil defense. Other power actors may participate as key power figures in a few selective issue areas. The civil defense change agent needs to be cautious in legitimizing all civil defense programs with one power structure. He needs to delineate the relevant power actors for the particular program which he desires to initiate and implement.

In small communities the local civil defense director is likely to find that many power actors who participate in legitimation stages of social action programs are also likely to participate in various phases of implementing the

program. But power actors may not participate in either legitimation or implementation of lower level community issue areas.

The local civil defense director needs to recognize that power actors in civil defense may have important systemic linkages to the relevant power actors in other issue areas such as general affairs and business and industry.

Through these systemic linkages the local civil defense director may have access to community resources which are needed to successfully initiate and implement his civil defense programs. In addition, the local civil defense director may bring about changes in the behavior of power actors and other community actors through these systemic linkages.

Power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions

The objective was to describe and compare some of the power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions in five communities. In addition, some implications for both the national and local civil defense officials were presented. The findings and the implications for civil defense officials are summarized in this summary section.

Attitudes toward civil defense

An individual's perception of the situation: perception of threat

The power actors perceived that we are not likely to have another big world war. If a war were to occur the power actors perceived it would occur six or more years beyond the time of the interviews (1962-1963). In general, they stated that if we did get into a future war with Russia, it would not be a conventional war. Power actors tended to feel that a small, local war would not escalate into a big war. The power actors perceived that their communities would be in danger from fallout if this country were attacked. And if there was an attack on the United States, they tended to perceive that their communities would have damage, but they believed that many or most people would survive. There was not a statistically significant difference among the attitudes of power actors in the five communities about the threat of war.

Implications for civil defense

The power actors in the five communities had similar attitudes about the perception of threat. There are several implications for civil defense change agents which can be derived from the findings of the various attitudes about the perception of threat. Although

several different alternatives and implications may be derived from these findings, only a few alternatives and implications were presented. The discussion of implications which follows may suggest to the reader ways in which civil defense officials may derive additional implications from the attitudinal findings.

Since the power actors perceived that we are not likely to have another big war in the near future and that small wars, such as Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic, would not escalate into a big war, it would seem logical to conclude that power actors in small communities would not see a great need for a shelter program at the present time. They would also be expected to have a low interest in present civil defense programs.

Although the power actors perceived that their communities would be in danger from fallout if this country were attacked, they perceived that many or most people would survive. Since the power actors are optimistic about their chances of survival, they may not be motivated to promote or participate in community civil defense programs.

Since power actors did not perceive a major threat of nuclear war, the local community civil defense director may need to communicate to the power actors the need for developing a community civil defense program, including a detailed plan, to help the community if a nuclear war did come in the future. While the power actors perceived that they had a good chance to survive in case of nuclear war, it would seem logical that the chances of survival of power actors and other community actors would be dependent upon the extent to which the community was prepared for nuclear war if that should occur. If power actors and other community members have a civil defense plan ready for operation in case of nuclear war, then they will increase their chances of survival.

The local civil defense director may need to change the attitudes of power actors about the relevance and importance of civil defense preparations. He may need to communicate the need for preparation in case of war in the future although power actors may see no threat of war at the present time. These types of implications about power actors' perception of threat should be helpful to civil defense officials as they develop messages to communicate to community power actors about civil defense and its relevance to communities.

Fallout shelters: perception of a civil defense innovation Nearly 70 percent of the power actors indicated that we should have a program that

licenses, marks, and stocks existing buildings for public shelter use. Approximately 45 percent perceived that we should have three other programs. They are (1) a program that encourages the construction of individual family shelters, (2) a federal program that makes available financial assistance for the construction of public shelter space in new public buildings, and (3) a program that encourages communities or local governmental units to construct their own locally financed community shelters. One-third of the power actors said that they would place the greatest emphasis on a program that encouraged the licensing, marking, and stocking of existing buildings for public shelter. Twenty-two percent indicated that they would place the greatest emphasis on a program that encourages the construction of individual family shelters. There was not a statistically significant difference among the power actors in five communities about alternative fallout shelter programs and the programs on which they would place the greatest emphasis.

Implications for civil defense The power actors in the five communities had similar attitudes about the various alternative civil defense fallout shelter programs. Civil defense officials should be aware of the power actors' present attitudes about public fallout shelters and consider them when developing public fallout shelter programs which are to be initiated and implemented in communities.

The civil defense change agent needs to be aware that power actors may be more likely to support public fallout shelter programs which utilize existing (both public and private) community buildings and future new buildings rather than public fallout shelter programs which would construct buildings solely for public shelter use. Since power actors do not perceive a great threat of nuclear war and do not favor a federally financed program to construct buildings solely for public shelter use, they are likely to oppose federally financed programs to construct buildings solely for public shelter use. If civil defense officials were to develop a federally financed program to construct buildings solely for public shelter use, then it appears that the attitudes of power actors would need to be changed prior to the acceptance of such a civil defense program by communities.

If the civil defense director considers the attitudes of power actors about alternative civil defense programs, he may be able to plan programs which are more readily accepted by power actors and other community actors. And if the attitudes are unfavorable toward fallout shelter programs, he may

need to change attitudes prior to initiating and implementing a civil defense fallout shelter program. A knowledge of the attitudes of power actors about public fallout shelters should aid the local civil defense director in planning and initiating fallout shelter programs.

Adequacy of civil defense programs The power actors tended to perceive the present national civil defense program and the present county civil defense program as inadequate. There was not a statistically significant difference among the attitudes of power actors in five communities as to the adequacy of civil defense programs at the national and county levels.

Implications for civil defense Even though power actors had a low perception of threat, they also perceived that the existing civil defense programs were inadequate. The finding that power actors do believe that existing civil defense programs are inadequate may be of considerable importance to civil defense officials. This belief may be one of the starting points for civil defense officials when soliciting support of power actors for civil defense.

A general civil defense attitude Power actors perceived that they had a community responsibility in the area of civil defense. Approximately 40 percent of the power actors indicated that they had a "major responsibility" in the area of civil defense, while nearly 50 percent said that they had "some responsibility" in the area of civil defense. There was not a statistically significant difference in the five communities about the power actors' responsibility in civil defense.

Implications for civil defense The local civil defense director is likely to find that the power actors in his community believe that they have a community responsibility in the area of civil defense. However, since power actors do not perceive a great threat of war, they may not be motivated to discharge the responsibility which they feel they have in the area of civil defense. They may not become involved in initiating and implementing civil defense programs. On the other hand, if power actors are motivated to discharge the responsibility they feel they have, then they may participate in legitimizing civil defense programs in the community and provide resources for civil defense programs.

Since power actors believe that they have a responsibility in the area of civil defense (perhaps indicating some motivation), but do not perceive a

threat of war, (perhaps indicating lack of motivation), the local civil defense director may need to further encourage power actors to become involved in civil defense programs. The local civil defense director may need to delineate and define the roles which power actors are likely to play in fulfilling their perceived community responsibility. And the local civil defense director may need to communicate information to the power actors which would help the power actors fulfill their responsibility. In addition, the power actors may help the local civil defense director bring about changes in the behavior of other community actors in the area of civil defense.

Knowledge of civil defense Power actors in the five communities tended to lack knowledge of a continuous civil defense program in their counties. In general, they did not have knowledge about the marking and stocking of buildings for fallout shelters. Although over one-half the power actors in two communities indicated that they knew their county had a civil defense director, power actors in the five communities as a group tended to respond "don't know" or "no" in response to the questions as to whether or not there was a civil defense director in their county. Nearly 30 percent of the 91 power actors were able to provide the right name of their county civil defense director.

There was a statistically significant difference among the power actors in five communities about the knowledge of planned local civil defense activities. Nearly 65 percent of the 91 power actors indicated they had not heard or read anything within the last few months about what civil defense people were doing or were planning to do in their county. In two communities (Prairie City and Annville) 88 and 70 percent of the individuals indicated that they had no knowledge of civil defense activity. The percentages for the other three communities ranged from 45 to approximately 55. Although there was a statistically significant difference among the five communities there was a tendency for power actors to lack knowledge about civil defense activity.

Implications for civil defense The local civil defense director may find that the power actors in his community do not have knowledge of past and present civil defense activities. In addition, the power actors may not even be aware that there is a community role of a local civil defense director.

The local civil defense director may need to develop messages which will increase the civil defense knowledge of community power actors. If the local civil defense director communicates the objectives and activities of the local

civil defense organization to the power actors, they may gain a better knowledge and understanding of the local civil defense organization and its programs.

Sources of civil defense information The three most frequently named sources from which power actors obtained information about civil defense were (1) daily or weekly newspapers, (2) television news and special programs, and (3) booklets and pamphlets put out by the Office of Civil Defense. The three most useful sources of information for power actors were (1) booklets and pamphlets put out by the Office of Civil Defense, (2) daily or weekly newspapers, and (3) television news and special programs. The sources of information used by power actors in each of the five communities were similar.

Implications for civil defense Since the power actors had little knowledge about civil defense, both national civil defense officials and local civil defense directors need to communicate messages to the power actors through a variety of communications media which are used by these power actors.

The local civil defense director may communicate messages to the power actors through daily or weekly newspapers. In larger communities which have a television station, the local civil defense director may communicate messages to power actors through this media about the local civil defense program. Since power actors within and between the five communities tended to have similar attitudes about civil defense and civil defense programs, the local civil defense director may want to develop messages specifically for the power actors. The local civil defense director may want to develop a mailing list of power actors. Specific messages about civil defense could then be sent to the community's power actors. If the local civil defense director is to communicate effectively to power actors, he may need to send messages through several different communications media.

There are also implications for national civil defense officials about the sources of information used by power actors to obtain information about civil defense. National civil defense officials may communicate information through television to community power actors which may bring about changes in the power actors' attitudes and knowledge about civil defense. In addition, the national civil defense officials may communicate messages to community power actors through special books and pamphlets. By using these communications media, the national civil defense officials may communicate messages which may bring changes in the power actors' attitudes and knowledge about civil defense.

Actions in civil defense Power actors tended not to be involved in working with or helping in the area of civil defense in their communities. In general, they had taken no action to protect themselves and their families against atomic attack or fallout. Thirty-three percent of the power actors indicated they had designated some specific area or place to be used if an emergency should occur, while approximately 25 percent of the power actors had seriously considered the need for protection but had made no specific plans for an emergency. Approximately 25 percent had never seriously considered the need for protection. There were no statistically significant differences among the power actors in the five communities about their actions in civil defense.

Implications for civil defense Since the power actors perceived that we are not likely to have another big war and lacked knowledge about local civil defense activities, their behavior in not taking any actions in the area of civil defense is consistent. The power actors in each of the five communities had generally not participated in civil defense activities. Therefore, the local civil defense director may find that most power actors are not involved in working with or helping in the area of civil defense in their community.

The local civil defense director may or may not directly involve power actors in the community's civil defense program. While some power actors may become involved in legitimizing and implementing civil defense programs, other power actors may not participate in civil defense activities. If power actors do become involved in initiating and implementing the community civil defense program, then the local civil defense director may give recognition to these power actors for their contribution toward the community civil defense program. This recognition may include communicating to the community about the power actors' participation in civil defense activities. Although some power actors may not become involved in initiating and implementing civil defense programs, they may support civil defense activities. And if they support civil defense activities and have a general knowledge of civil defense, they may be able to change the attitudes and knowledge of other community actors about civil defense.

In summary, the power actors in five communities were found to have similar personal and social characteristics. They were perceived to have social power if their communities were to build a community fallout shelter in the

near future. Some of the perceived top power actors in civil defense were also among the top power actors in other non-civil defense issue areas. Other perceived top power actors in civil defense were not among the top power actors in other non-civil defense issue areas. It was concluded that the power structure in civil defense is likely to vary in comparison with the power structures in other community issue areas. The power actors in the five communities were found to have similar civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions.

The above data provide insights about social power in local communities. Some implications based on these empirical findings for both the national and local civil defense change agents were presented. These data may be used by the Office of Civil Defense in initiating, planning, and implementing future civil defense programs and in training civil defense personnel.

Unclassified
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D		
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)		
1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Department of Sociology Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa		2a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified
		2b GROUP
3 REPORT TITLE A SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT COMMUNITY POWER ACTORS AND CIVIL DEFENSE A delineation of community power actors and an analysis of their civil defense attitudes, knowledge, behavior, and sources of information.		
4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Summary of Final Report		
5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Bohlen, Joe M., Beal, George M., Klonglan, Gerald E., Tait, John L.		
6 REPORT DATE 1965	7a TOTAL NO OF PAGES 18	7b. NO. OF REFS
8a CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. OCD-PS-65-9 b. PROJECT NO. (Subtask) 4811-D c. Systems Evaluation Division d. OCD Research Directorate	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Rural Sociology Report Number 405 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Distribution of this report is unlimited.		
11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Companion report is Rural Sociology Report No. 35		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Office of Civil Defense Department of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310
13 ABSTRACT The local community is conceptualized as a <u>social system</u> . One of the elements of the social system is <u>social power</u> . A <u>social power model</u> is defined which may be used by the local civil defense director for analyzing <u>social power</u> in his community. The major concepts of the <u>social power model</u> are <u>authority</u> , <u>influence</u> , and <u>power structure</u> . The community members who have <u>social power</u> and affect the community decision-making process are designated as <u>power actors</u> . The <u>power actors</u> in <u>five</u> Iowa communities were interviewed. They were found to have <u>similar personal and social characteristics</u> . The power actors were perceived to have <u>social power</u> if the community was to build a community fallout shelter in the near future. The <u>power actors' civil defense attitudes, knowledge, sources of information, and actions</u> were analyzed. The power actors (1) had a low perception of threat, (2) perceived that we should have civil defense programs which (a) licenses, marks, and stocks existing buildings, (b) encourages the construction of individual family shelters, (c) makes available financial assistance for the construction of public shelter spaces in new public buildings, and (d) encourages communities or local governmental units to construct their own locally financed community shelters, (3) tended to perceive the <u>national</u> civil defense program and the <u>present county</u> civil defense program as inadequate, (4) perceived that they had a civil defense responsibility, and (5) generally lacked a knowledge of civil defense programs. The three <u>most frequently</u> named sources of civil defense information were (1) daily or weekly newspapers, (2) television news and special programs, and (3) booklets and pamphlets put out by OCD. Most power actors had not helped with civil defense programs in their communities. Implications for <u>civil defense officials</u> based on the findings are presented.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

Unclassified
Security Classification

KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Local civil defense director Local community Social system model Belief (knowledge) Sentiment End, goals, or objec- tive Norm Status-role (position) Rank Sanction Facility Power						
INSTRUCTIONS						
<p>1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.</p> <p>2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.</p> <p>2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.</p> <p>3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.</p> <p>4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.</p> <p>5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.</p> <p>6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.</p> <p>7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.</p> <p>7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.</p> <p>8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.</p> <p>8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.</p> <p>9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.</p> <p>9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).</p> <p>10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:</p> <p>(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."</p> <p>(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."</p> <p>(3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."</p> <p>(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."</p> <p>(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."</p> <p>If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.</p> <p>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.</p> <p>12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.</p> <p>13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.</p> <p>It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).</p> <p>There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.</p> <p>14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.</p>						